

NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER.

THE GENERAL COURT MARTIAL, NOW IN SESSION.

We are indebted to the Washington "Union" for the following account of the proceedings of the Court Martial in the case of General TALCOTT:

MONDAY, JUNE 23, 1851.

THE MILITARY COURT MARTIAL, convened for the trial of Brevet Brigadier General TALCOTT, Colonel and Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, met at twelve o'clock. Present, Brevet Major General D. E. TWIGGS, (President); J. E. WOOL, P. F. SMITH, B. RILEY, G. GRADY, Brigadiers General J. B. WALBRIDGE, S. C. CHURCHILL, T. G. TOTTER, T. CHILDS, J. J. ARNET, Colonel J. B. CHASE, Brevet Colonel J. P. LINTON; Brevet Major J. F. LEE, Judge Advocate. J. M. CARLISLE, Esq., counsel for Gen. Talcott. Brevet Major General N. S. CLARK, absent.

After the Court was duly organized, the Judge Advocate read the order from the War Department to the Court.

The Court was ordered to be cleared.

Upon the re-opening of the Court, the Judge Advocate stated that it stood adjourned until to-morrow morning, at nine o'clock, in consequence of the absence of Gen. CHASE.

TUESDAY, JUNE 24, 1851.

The Court met at 9 o'clock, and the record of yesterday was read.

A note was received from General TALCOTT respectfully requesting that the trial be not commenced until after the arrival of the eleven o'clock train, in the hope that this would enable him to be present, and he did not wish to be absent from the trial to protect himself with a full record.

The Court was ordered to be cleared.

The Court re-assembled at the appointed hour, and the Judge Advocate stated that it stood adjourned until to-morrow morning, at nine o'clock, in consequence of the absence of Gen. CHASE.

The Judge Advocate asked Gen. TALCOTT if he objected to any member of the Court.

No objection being made, the charges were then read. They are three in number, all relating to the same transaction, the various facts and circumstances being set out in a number of specifications.

Charge first is for violation of the 133d article of Ordnance regulations, which directs that no contract for ordnance stores or supplies shall be made by any officer or agent of the corps without special authority of the Colonel of Ordnance, and that no contract shall be made by any officer or agent of the corps without special authority of the Colonel of Ordnance, and that no contract shall be made by any officer or agent of the corps without special authority of the Colonel of Ordnance.

Charge second is for disobedience of orders and instructions of the Secretary of War, in relation to the purchase of ordnance stores and supplies, which was set out in a number of specifications.

Charge third is for conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman—the specifications alleging various false statements and reports to the Secretary, to the effect that no such contract existed.

The Judge Advocate then asked the accused if he pleaded guilty or not guilty. Gen. Talcott replied in the negative, and handed to the Court the following, which was read:

Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Court:

Desiring to interpose no obstacles to a full and fair inquiry into the facts upon which these charges and specifications have been made, I respectfully request that you may be allowed to reserve all matters touching their sufficiency in fact, to be used in the discretion of counsel at the summing up of my defence; and with this reservation I now plead to all and singular the said charges and specifications, not guilty.

Appearing before you under circumstances for which I have no excuse, and in the face of the experience of my past life, I desire to intrust the defence of my honor and character to a professional friend here present; and to this end I request that J. M. Carlisle, Esq., a member of the bar of this city, may be allowed to attend me during the open sessions of the Court, under all the restrictions or otherwise imposed upon counsel in courts martial.

G. TALCOTT,
Brevet Brigadier General.

JUNE 24, 1851.

Mr. CARLISLE stated that he had been some time since summoned the Hon. Wm. L. Marcy as a witness on his part, but that he had not yet come; and, in case of his not appearing, he should expect a reasonable delay from the court, in order that his testimony might be obtained.

The Judge Advocate remarked to the court that, by an agreement with the counsel of the accused, they had determined to examine witnesses only upon the points in the case in the order of time in which they occurred, and thus present a continuous narrative. This would necessarily involve the calling of some of the witnesses as "verbalists"; but the Court would find that they would arrive at the facts much sooner in this way than in any other.

Captain MATTHEWS called. He stated that he was the principal assistant to the Chief of the Ordnance Department, and had been on duty from February 1, 1842, to the present time continuously, and during that period Gen. Talcott had been in charge of the Bureau. He stated that the usual annual appropriation for the Bureau was \$100,000, which was for some time reduced to the amount of \$75,000 by the late Secretary of War, Mr. Pickens. During the temporary absence of Gen. Talcott, in 1850, I was in charge of the Bureau. Dr. Carmichael called and submitted to me certain papers from ex-President Tyler and ex-Secretary Wilkes, by virtue of which he claimed to be entitled to a contract for shot and shells. I referred the papers to the Secretary of War (Mr. Crawford), by whom the papers were sent to me for an official report.

[The report was then read. The purport of it was, that the Government did not require any shot or shells, but, even if it did, it would be necessary that an appropriation should be made for the purchase of the same.]

Dr. Carmichael then stated that he had been on duty from February 1, 1842, to the present time continuously, and during that period Gen. Talcott had been in charge of the Bureau. He stated that the usual annual appropriation for the Bureau was \$100,000, which was for some time reduced to the amount of \$75,000 by the late Secretary of War, Mr. Pickens. During the temporary absence of Gen. Talcott, in 1850, I was in charge of the Bureau. Dr. Carmichael called and submitted to me certain papers from ex-President Tyler and ex-Secretary Wilkes, by virtue of which he claimed to be entitled to a contract for shot and shells. I referred the papers to the Secretary of War (Mr. Crawford), by whom the papers were sent to me for an official report.

[The report was then read. The purport of it was, that the Government did not require any shot or shells, but, even if it did, it would be necessary that an appropriation should be made for the purchase of the same.]

Dr. Carmichael then stated that he had been on duty from February 1, 1842, to the present time continuously, and during that period Gen. Talcott had been in charge of the Bureau. He stated that the usual annual appropriation for the Bureau was \$100,000, which was for some time reduced to the amount of \$75,000 by the late Secretary of War, Mr. Pickens. During the temporary absence of Gen. Talcott, in 1850, I was in charge of the Bureau. Dr. Carmichael called and submitted to me certain papers from ex-President Tyler and ex-Secretary Wilkes, by virtue of which he claimed to be entitled to a contract for shot and shells. I referred the papers to the Secretary of War (Mr. Crawford), by whom the papers were sent to me for an official report.

[The report was then read. The purport of it was, that the Government did not require any shot or shells, but, even if it did, it would be necessary that an appropriation should be made for the purchase of the same.]

Dr. Carmichael then stated that he had been on duty from February 1, 1842, to the present time continuously, and during that period Gen. Talcott had been in charge of the Bureau. He stated that the usual annual appropriation for the Bureau was \$100,000, which was for some time reduced to the amount of \$75,000 by the late Secretary of War, Mr. Pickens. During the temporary absence of Gen. Talcott, in 1850, I was in charge of the Bureau. Dr. Carmichael called and submitted to me certain papers from ex-President Tyler and ex-Secretary Wilkes, by virtue of which he claimed to be entitled to a contract for shot and shells. I referred the papers to the Secretary of War (Mr. Crawford), by whom the papers were sent to me for an official report.

[The report was then read. The purport of it was, that the Government did not require any shot or shells, but, even if it did, it would be necessary that an appropriation should be made for the purchase of the same.]

Dr. Carmichael then stated that he had been on duty from February 1, 1842, to the present time continuously, and during that period Gen. Talcott had been in charge of the Bureau. He stated that the usual annual appropriation for the Bureau was \$100,000, which was for some time reduced to the amount of \$75,000 by the late Secretary of War, Mr. Pickens. During the temporary absence of Gen. Talcott, in 1850, I was in charge of the Bureau. Dr. Carmichael called and submitted to me certain papers from ex-President Tyler and ex-Secretary Wilkes, by virtue of which he claimed to be entitled to a contract for shot and shells. I referred the papers to the Secretary of War (Mr. Crawford), by whom the papers were sent to me for an official report.

[The report was then read. The purport of it was, that the Government did not require any shot or shells, but, even if it did, it would be necessary that an appropriation should be made for the purchase of the same.]

Dr. Carmichael then stated that he had been on duty from February 1, 1842, to the present time continuously, and during that period Gen. Talcott had been in charge of the Bureau. He stated that the usual annual appropriation for the Bureau was \$100,000, which was for some time reduced to the amount of \$75,000 by the late Secretary of War, Mr. Pickens. During the temporary absence of Gen. Talcott, in 1850, I was in charge of the Bureau. Dr. Carmichael called and submitted to me certain papers from ex-President Tyler and ex-Secretary Wilkes, by virtue of which he claimed to be entitled to a contract for shot and shells. I referred the papers to the Secretary of War (Mr. Crawford), by whom the papers were sent to me for an official report.

[The report was then read. The purport of it was, that the Government did not require any shot or shells, but, even if it did, it would be necessary that an appropriation should be made for the purchase of the same.]

Dr. Carmichael then stated that he had been on duty from February 1, 1842, to the present time continuously, and during that period Gen. Talcott had been in charge of the Bureau. He stated that the usual annual appropriation for the Bureau was \$100,000, which was for some time reduced to the amount of \$75,000 by the late Secretary of War, Mr. Pickens. During the temporary absence of Gen. Talcott, in 1850, I was in charge of the Bureau. Dr. Carmichael called and submitted to me certain papers from ex-President Tyler and ex-Secretary Wilkes, by virtue of which he claimed to be entitled to a contract for shot and shells. I referred the papers to the Secretary of War (Mr. Crawford), by whom the papers were sent to me for an official report.

[The report was then read. The purport of it was, that the Government did not require any shot or shells, but, even if it did, it would be necessary that an appropriation should be made for the purchase of the same.]

Dr. Carmichael then stated that he had been on duty from February 1, 1842, to the present time continuously, and during that period Gen. Talcott had been in charge of the Bureau. He stated that the usual annual appropriation for the Bureau was \$100,000, which was for some time reduced to the amount of \$75,000 by the late Secretary of War, Mr. Pickens. During the temporary absence of Gen. Talcott, in 1850, I was in charge of the Bureau. Dr. Carmichael called and submitted to me certain papers from ex-President Tyler and ex-Secretary Wilkes, by virtue of which he claimed to be entitled to a contract for shot and shells. I referred the papers to the Secretary of War (Mr. Crawford), by whom the papers were sent to me for an official report.

[The report was then read. The purport of it was, that the Government did not require any shot or shells, but, even if it did, it would be necessary that an appropriation should be made for the purchase of the same.]

Dr. Carmichael then stated that he had been on duty from February 1, 1842, to the present time continuously, and during that period Gen. Talcott had been in charge of the Bureau. He stated that the usual annual appropriation for the Bureau was \$100,000, which was for some time reduced to the amount of \$75,000 by the late Secretary of War, Mr. Pickens. During the temporary absence of Gen. Talcott, in 1850, I was in charge of the Bureau. Dr. Carmichael called and submitted to me certain papers from ex-President Tyler and ex-Secretary Wilkes, by virtue of which he claimed to be entitled to a contract for shot and shells. I referred the papers to the Secretary of War (Mr. Crawford), by whom the papers were sent to me for an official report.

[The report was then read. The purport of it was, that the Government did not require any shot or shells, but, even if it did, it would be necessary that an appropriation should be made for the purchase of the same.]

Dr. Carmichael then stated that he had been on duty from February 1, 1842, to the present time continuously, and during that period Gen. Talcott had been in charge of the Bureau. He stated that the usual annual appropriation for the Bureau was \$100,000, which was for some time reduced to the amount of \$75,000 by the late Secretary of War, Mr. Pickens. During the temporary absence of Gen. Talcott, in 1850, I was in charge of the Bureau. Dr. Carmichael called and submitted to me certain papers from ex-President Tyler and ex-Secretary Wilkes, by virtue of which he claimed to be entitled to a contract for shot and shells. I referred the papers to the Secretary of War (Mr. Crawford), by whom the papers were sent to me for an official report.

[The report was then read. The purport of it was, that the Government did not require any shot or shells, but, even if it did, it would be necessary that an appropriation should be made for the purchase of the same.]

Dr. Carmichael then stated that he had been on duty from February 1, 1842, to the present time continuously, and during that period Gen. Talcott had been in charge of the Bureau. He stated that the usual annual appropriation for the Bureau was \$100,000, which was for some time reduced to the amount of \$75,000 by the late Secretary of War, Mr. Pickens. During the temporary absence of Gen. Talcott, in 1850, I was in charge of the Bureau. Dr. Carmichael called and submitted to me certain papers from ex-President Tyler and ex-Secretary Wilkes, by virtue of which he claimed to be entitled to a contract for shot and shells. I referred the papers to the Secretary of War (Mr. Crawford), by whom the papers were sent to me for an official report.

[The report was then read. The purport of it was, that the Government did not require any shot or shells, but, even if it did, it would be necessary that an appropriation should be made for the purchase of the same.]

Dr. Carmichael then stated that he had been on duty from February 1, 1842, to the present time continuously, and during that period Gen. Talcott had been in charge of the Bureau. He stated that the usual annual appropriation for the Bureau was \$100,000, which was for some time reduced to the amount of \$75,000 by the late Secretary of War, Mr. Pickens. During the temporary absence of Gen. Talcott, in 1850, I was in charge of the Bureau. Dr. Carmichael called and submitted to me certain papers from ex-President Tyler and ex-Secretary Wilkes, by virtue of which he claimed to be entitled to a contract for shot and shells. I referred the papers to the Secretary of War (Mr. Crawford), by whom the papers were sent to me for an official report.

[The report was then read. The purport of it was, that the Government did not require any shot or shells, but, even if it did, it would be necessary that an appropriation should be made for the purchase of the same.]

Dr. Carmichael then stated that he had been on duty from February 1, 1842, to the present time continuously, and during that period Gen. Talcott had been in charge of the Bureau. He stated that the usual annual appropriation for the Bureau was \$100,000, which was for some time reduced to the amount of \$75,000 by the late Secretary of War, Mr. Pickens. During the temporary absence of Gen. Talcott, in 1850, I was in charge of the Bureau. Dr. Carmichael called and submitted to me certain papers from ex-President Tyler and ex-Secretary Wilkes, by virtue of which he claimed to be entitled to a contract for shot and shells. I referred the papers to the Secretary of War (Mr. Crawford), by whom the papers were sent to me for an official report.

[The report was then read. The purport of it was, that the Government did not require any shot or shells, but, even if it did, it would be necessary that an appropriation should be made for the purchase of the same.]

Dr. Carmichael then stated that he had been on duty from February 1, 1842, to the present time continuously, and during that period Gen. Talcott had been in charge of the Bureau. He stated that the usual annual appropriation for the Bureau was \$100,000, which was for some time reduced to the amount of \$75,000 by the late Secretary of War, Mr. Pickens. During the temporary absence of Gen. Talcott, in 1850, I was in charge of the Bureau. Dr. Carmichael called and submitted to me certain papers from ex-President Tyler and ex-Secretary Wilkes, by virtue of which he claimed to be entitled to a contract for shot and shells. I referred the papers to the Secretary of War (Mr. Crawford), by whom the papers were sent to me for an official report.

[The report was then read. The purport of it was, that the Government did not require any shot or shells, but, even if it did, it would be necessary that an appropriation should be made for the purchase of the same.]

Dr. Carmichael then stated that he had been on duty from February 1, 1842, to the present time continuously, and during that period Gen. Talcott had been in charge of the Bureau. He stated that the usual annual appropriation for the Bureau was \$100,000, which was for some time reduced to the amount of \$75,000 by the late Secretary of War, Mr. Pickens. During the temporary absence of Gen. Talcott, in 1850, I was in charge of the Bureau. Dr. Carmichael called and submitted to me certain papers from ex-President Tyler and ex-Secretary Wilkes, by virtue of which he claimed to be entitled to a contract for shot and shells. I referred the papers to the Secretary of War (Mr. Crawford), by whom the papers were sent to me for an official report.

[The report was then read. The purport of it was, that the Government did not require any shot or shells, but, even if it did, it would be necessary that an appropriation should be made for the purchase of the same.]

Dr. Carmichael then stated that he had been on duty from February 1, 1842, to the present time continuously, and during that period Gen. Talcott had been in charge of the Bureau. He stated that the usual annual appropriation for the Bureau was \$100,000, which was for some time reduced to the amount of \$75,000 by the late Secretary of War, Mr. Pickens. During the temporary absence of Gen. Talcott, in 1850, I was in charge of the Bureau. Dr. Carmichael called and submitted to me certain papers from ex-President Tyler and ex-Secretary Wilkes, by virtue of which he claimed to be entitled to a contract for shot and shells. I referred the papers to the Secretary of War (Mr. Crawford), by whom the papers were sent to me for an official report.

[The report was then read. The purport of it was, that the Government did not require any shot or shells, but, even if it did, it would be necessary that an appropriation should be made for the purchase of the same.]

Question. Did Gen. Talcott take any part in the above conversation?

Answer. My recollection is, that during the whole of the conversation Gen. Talcott was silent. Indeed, I was somewhat surprised when I had looked at the papers, at his refusal to take any part in the conversation. I was somewhat surprised when I had looked at the papers, at his refusal to take any part in the conversation.

Question. Did you see any papers in the hands of Gen. Talcott?

Answer. I do not recollect whether I did or not. I furnished Doctor Carmichael with a memorandum of such shot and shells as I thought it advantageous for the United States to procure. On the 8th of November Doctor Carmichael returned to Fort Monroe from Washington, and handed me a letter authorizing me to procure shot and shells, signed by General Talcott. [Letter read in evidence.] When he brought me that letter I gave him an order for a supply. One person who I was induced to give him this order immediately was, that a foundry near Fredericksburg, of which he was the proprietor, was the only one that I understood from him that they were to be made at that same foundry. It was distinctly understood that they were to be made at that foundry, and that fact had great weight with me in giving him the order. Doctor Carmichael also handed me a memorandum from a clerk in the Ordnance Department, (Alger) showing that he had received a letter from Mr. Alger, stating that, upon examination, he found some shot had been purchased at a less rate; this was the price stipulated for by Doctor Carmichael, with an additional fraction to cover the expense of transportation from the foundry to Fort Monroe. By the next mail I received a letter from Mr. Alger, stating that, upon examination, he found some shot had been purchased at a less rate; this was the price stipulated for by Doctor Carmichael, with an additional fraction to cover the expense of transportation from the foundry to Fort Monroe. By the next mail I received a letter from Mr. Alger, stating that, upon examination, he found some shot had been purchased at a less rate; this was the price stipulated for by Doctor Carmichael, with an additional fraction to cover the expense of transportation from the foundry to Fort Monroe.

Question by defence. Did Doctor Carmichael state the time and place where the verbal contract with Mr. Crawford was made?

Answer. I do not think that Doctor Carmichael stated any particular time or place.

Question by defence. Did you consider it necessary for Gen. Talcott to explain to you the nature of the papers when you had them in your own examination?

Answer. My looking at the papers at all was entirely accidental. If Gen. Talcott had stated to me officially that there was such a contract, I would have taken the fact for granted, as I am in the daily habit of doing in reference to contracts made by all the bureaus. And when Doctor Carmichael made this assertion in his presence, and he remained silent, I considered it at the time as equivalent to his making the declaration himself, or nearly so; and I took the papers with an entire conviction that I should find in them a recognition of the contract by Mr. Crawford, and was a good deal surprised when I found that it was not so.

The hour of 9 o'clock having arrived, the Court adjourned until this morning at 9 o'clock.

THIRD DAY—WEDNESDAY, JUNE 25, 1851.

Cross-examination of the Secretary of War—Continued.

Question. You stated in your direct examination yesterday that when you asked Mr. Carmichael if he had received the recognition of the contract, he answered that the price of the shot and shells in the case would show it; and that you thereupon asked General Talcott if the papers he held in his hand were the papers in the case, to which he answered they were, and handed them to you upon your request. Have you any recollection that the said papers, which, according to your recollection, were handed to you by General Talcott, were other or less than the true papers, necessary to the decision of the question whether such recognition had in fact and law been made?

Answer. I have no such knowledge.

Question. You have stated that the said bundle of papers contained the original declaration itself. Mr. Secretary Crawford upon the validity of the said alleged contract. Are you able to state what other papers it contained?

Answer. I do not know that it is an original; I am not sufficiently acquainted with his handwriting. I do not think that I saw any other paper in the package except the letter from Mr. Crawford, referred to in my testimony of yesterday. I took up that because I saw the name of Mr. Crawford appended to it. I asked Doctor Carmichael if that was the paper which contained Mr. Crawford's recognition. He said it was; and he never alluded to other papers than the one in question.

Question. When Mr. Carmichael answered your inquiry whether there was a contract made with Mr. Crawford, what induced you to ask General Talcott if they were the papers?

Answer. I presume that I was induced to ask that question, because the idea occurred to me that if they were the papers, I would look for any thing in them of a positive character against his claim, and amongst them a clear written decision against him by Mr. Crawford, could you suppose that he meant knowingly to endorse an untrue, the means of exposing which he himself at the same time, as you say, held open under your eyes in such a manner as to lead you to understand that it was the paper referred to?

Answer. I did not say that he held the papers conspicuously before me, or so as to invite my attention, but he held the papers openly in his hand. Upon the supposition that I would examine the papers, I might not examine the papers, but, upon the supposition that I might not examine the papers, such a design is perfectly consistent with the fact of his having the papers in his hand.

Question. Can you suggest a reason why Gen. Talcott would have brought these papers before you, (if he did), while he meant to give countenance to an assertion positively refuted by them?

Answer. I could only give suspicions. I do not desire to give them, unless the Court desire me to give them. I know no facts. I desire to correct my answer. Speaking of suspicion, I thought that Gen. Talcott's conduct was strange and singular, and I reflected on it after he had left the room, and also the day after—so much so that it made an impression on my memory. It struck me as strange at the time, and more so in consequence of what Gen. Talcott answered when I asked him if he had the papers in his hand.

Question. Did Dr. Carmichael make any other application to you than that specified in the interview in question, viz. to redeem the pledge which he alleged the former had made him?

Answer. Dr. Carmichael urged upon me to allow him to make a quantity of shot, partly on the ground of a positive contract, and partly on account of equitable circumstances which he mentioned—such as having made arrangements to comply with the contract and having been disappointed; and in fact used every means to induce me to give him a contract, as every people do who want to make one with the Government, and mentioned among other things that he was going to live in my city, New Orleans. I was inflexible, however, and perhaps should have made him some limitation, because I thought he had attempted to introduce a deception upon me, and he finally gave up in despair.

Question. Please state at what time you left this city in the month of October, when did you return to it?

Answer. I left in the early part of October, and was gone a fortnight or twenty days. I returned on the 23d of October, 1850, as the records of the Department show, and resumed the business of the Department on the 24th.

Question by the Court. Was there any thing in the circumstances of the case which induced you to reflect on the conduct of Doctor Carmichael, and to make the statement which you made at that interview, having given the opinion he afterwards expressed, viz. that there was no pledge in Mr. Crawford's letter, provided you, in the mean time, had not come to the same opinion by the personal of Mr. Crawford's letter?

Answer. The reason why I reflected on the conduct of Doctor Carmichael, and to make the statement which you made at that interview, having given the opinion he afterwards expressed, viz. that there was no pledge in Mr. Crawford's letter, provided you, in the mean time, had not come to the same opinion by the personal of Mr. Crawford's letter?

Answer. The reason why I reflected on the conduct of Doctor Carmichael, and to make the statement which you made at that interview, having given the opinion he afterwards expressed, viz. that there was no pledge in Mr. Crawford's letter, provided you, in the mean time, had not come to the same opinion by the personal of Mr. Crawford's letter?

Answer. The reason why I reflected on the conduct of Doctor Carmichael, and to make the statement which you made at that interview, having given the opinion he afterwards expressed, viz. that there was no pledge in Mr. Crawford's letter, provided you, in the mean time, had not come to the same opinion by the personal of Mr. Crawford's letter?

Answer. The reason why I reflected on the conduct of Doctor Carmichael, and to make the statement which you made at that interview, having given the opinion he afterwards expressed, viz. that there was no pledge in Mr. Crawford's letter, provided you, in the mean time, had not come to the same opinion by the personal of Mr. Crawford's letter?

Answer. The reason why I reflected on the conduct of Doctor Carmichael, and to make the statement which you made at that interview, having given the opinion he afterwards expressed, viz. that there was no pledge in Mr. Crawford's letter, provided you, in the mean time, had not come to the same opinion by the personal of Mr. Crawford's letter?

Answer. The reason why I reflected on the conduct of Doctor Carmichael, and to make the statement which you made at that interview, having given the opinion he afterwards expressed, viz. that there was no pledge in Mr. Crawford's letter, provided you, in the mean time, had not come to the same opinion by the personal of Mr. Crawford's letter?

Answer. The reason why I reflected on the conduct of Doctor Carmichael, and to make the statement which you made at that interview, having given the opinion he afterwards expressed, viz. that there was no pledge in Mr. Crawford's letter, provided you, in the mean time, had not come to the same opinion by the personal of Mr. Crawford's letter?

Answer. The reason why I reflected on the conduct of Doctor Carmichael, and to make the statement which you made at that interview, having given the opinion he afterwards expressed, viz. that there was no pledge in Mr. Crawford's letter, provided you, in the mean time, had not come to the same opinion by the personal of Mr. Crawford's letter?

Answer. The reason why I reflected on the conduct of Doctor Carmichael, and to make the statement which you made at that interview, having given the opinion he afterwards expressed, viz. that there was no pledge in Mr. Crawford's letter, provided you, in the mean time, had not come to the same opinion by the personal of Mr. Crawford's letter?

Answer. The reason why I reflected on the conduct of Doctor Carmichael, and to make the statement which you made at that interview, having given the opinion he afterwards expressed, viz. that there was no pledge in Mr. Crawford's letter, provided you, in the mean time, had not come to the same opinion by the personal of Mr. Crawford's letter?

Answer. The reason why I reflected on the conduct of Doctor Carmichael, and to make the statement which you made at that interview, having given the opinion he afterwards expressed, viz. that there was no pledge in Mr. Crawford's letter, provided you, in the mean time, had not come to the same opinion by the personal of Mr. Crawford's letter?

Answer. The reason why I reflected on the conduct of Doctor Carmichael, and to make the statement which you made at that interview, having given the opinion he afterwards expressed, viz. that there was no pledge in Mr. Crawford's letter, provided you, in the mean time, had not come to the same opinion by the personal of Mr. Crawford's letter?

Answer. The reason why I reflected on the conduct of Doctor Carmichael, and to make the statement which you made at that interview, having given the opinion he afterwards expressed, viz. that there was no pledge in Mr. Crawford's letter, provided you, in the mean time, had not come to the same opinion by the personal of Mr. Crawford's letter?

Answer. The reason why I reflected on the conduct of Doctor Carmichael, and to make the statement which you made at that interview, having given the opinion he afterwards expressed, viz. that there was no pledge in Mr. Crawford's letter, provided you, in the mean time, had not come to the same opinion by the personal of Mr. Crawford's letter?

Answer. The reason why I reflected on the conduct of Doctor Carmichael, and to make the statement which you made at that interview, having given the opinion he afterwards expressed, viz. that there was no pledge in Mr. Crawford's letter, provided you, in the mean time, had not come to the same opinion by the personal of Mr. Crawford's letter?

Answer. The reason why I reflected on the conduct of Doctor Carmichael, and to make the statement which you made at that interview, having given the opinion he afterwards expressed, viz. that there was no pledge in Mr. Crawford's letter, provided you, in the mean time, had not come to the same opinion by the personal of Mr. Crawford's letter?

Answer. The reason why I reflected on the conduct of Doctor Carmichael, and to make the statement which you made at that interview, having given the opinion he afterwards expressed, viz. that there was no pledge in Mr. Crawford's letter, provided you, in the mean time, had not come to the same opinion by the personal of Mr. Crawford's letter?

Answer. The reason why I reflected on the conduct of Doctor Carmichael, and to make the statement which you made at that interview, having given the opinion he afterwards expressed, viz. that there was no pledge in Mr. Crawford's letter, provided you, in the mean time, had not come to the same opinion by the personal of Mr. Crawford's letter?

Answer. The reason why I reflected on the conduct of Doctor Carmichael, and to make the statement which you made at that interview, having given the opinion he afterwards expressed, viz. that there was no pledge in Mr. Crawford's letter, provided you, in the mean time, had not come to the same opinion by the personal of Mr. Crawford's letter?

Answer. The reason why I reflected on the conduct of Doctor Carmichael, and to make the statement which you made at that interview, having given the opinion he afterwards expressed, viz. that there was no pledge in Mr. Crawford's letter, provided you, in the mean time, had not come to the same opinion by the personal of Mr. Crawford's letter?

Answer. The reason why I reflected on the conduct of Doctor Carmichael, and to make the statement which you made at that interview, having given the opinion he afterwards expressed, viz. that there was no pledge in Mr. Crawford's letter, provided you, in the mean time, had not come to the same opinion by the personal of Mr. Crawford's letter?

Answer. The reason why I reflected on the conduct of Doctor Carmichael, and to make the statement which you made at that interview, having given the opinion he afterwards expressed, viz. that there was no pledge in Mr. Crawford's letter, provided you, in the mean time, had not come to the same opinion by the personal of Mr. Crawford's letter?

Answer. The reason why I reflected on the conduct of Doctor Carmichael, and to make the statement which you made at that interview, having given the opinion he afterwards expressed, viz. that there was no pledge in Mr. Crawford's letter, provided you, in the mean time, had not come to the same opinion by the personal of Mr. Crawford's letter?

Answer. The reason why I reflected on the conduct of Doctor Carmichael, and to make the statement which you made at that interview, having given the opinion he afterwards expressed, viz. that there was no pledge in Mr. Crawford's letter, provided you, in the mean time, had not come to the same opinion by the personal of Mr. Crawford's letter?

Answer. The reason why I reflected on the conduct of Doctor Carmichael, and to make the statement which you made at that interview, having given the opinion he afterwards expressed, viz. that there was no pledge in Mr. Crawford's letter, provided you, in the mean time, had not come to the same opinion by the personal of Mr. Crawford's letter?

Answer. The reason why I reflected on the conduct of Doctor Carmichael, and to make the statement which you made at that interview, having given the opinion he afterwards expressed,